

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN**

JUSTIN P. WELCH,

Plaintiff,

-vs-

Case No. 15-CV-191

KYLE K. TRITT, et al.,

Defendants.

DECISION AND ORDER

This *pro se* plaintiff is a Wisconsin state prisoner, currently incarcerated at Waupun Correctional Institution, although according to the plaintiff he may soon be transferred to the Wisconsin Resource Center for treatment. The plaintiff, via another inmate who according to the motions, has written this filing on the plaintiff's behalf, has again requested in two separate motions that the Court reconsider its decision to deny the plaintiff's motion for appointment of counsel.

The Court first denied the plaintiff's request for the appointment of counsel on May 21, 2015. On June 22, 2015, the plaintiff filed a motion asking the Court to reconsider its denial. The following day, the Court declined to reconsider its decision and, in response to the plaintiff's representation that he did not know what to do next, directed the plaintiff to the discovery rules and provided him with a pamphlet entitled "Answers

to Prisoner Litigants' Common Questions.”

Two days later, the plaintiff filed two additional motions for reconsideration again asking the Court to appoint counsel for the plaintiff. Although both motions were filed on June 25, 2015, the first motion (ECF No. 26) is dated May 29, 2015 and the second motion (ECF No. 28) is dated June 15, 2015. Thus, it appears that both motions were prepared before the Court's decision on the plaintiff's first motion for reconsideration. The second and third motions for reconsideration reiterate the reasons set forth in the plaintiff's first motion. The motions also explain, for the first time, that the plaintiff will be transferred to the Wisconsin Resource Center, which has no law library.

For the reasons explained in its May 21, 2015 and June 23, 2015 decisions, the Court denies the plaintiff's request to appoint counsel at this time. As previously explained, now that defendants have answered the plaintiff's complaint, the plaintiff may ask the defendants to answer his interrogatories regarding the alleged events (Fed. R. Civ. Pro. 33), and he may conduct discovery regarding any reports or records that resulted from the alleged events (Fed. R. Civ. Pro. 34). A law library is not necessary to complete these tasks, so the plaintiff's transfer to the Wisconsin Resource

Center is not adequate in and of itself to require that the Court reconsider its denial of the plaintiff's request for counsel. The Court continues to believe that the plaintiff can proceed on his own at this time.

NOW, THEREFORE, BASED ON THE FOREGOING, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT the plaintiff's motions for reconsideration (ECF Nos. 26, 28) are **DENIED**.

Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, this 29th day of June, 2015.

BY THE COURT:


HON. RUDOLPH T. RANDA
U.S. District Judge